Peking's Peace Offer to Chiang, P. 3

U. S. Chamber of Commerce Sees New Boom, Not Depression, in Disarmament, See Page 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VII, NO. 40 OCTOBER 26, 1959 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Is Krupp to Be Our Partner in Merchandising Death?

Those who recall the revelations made by Thurman Arnold before the Truman committee after Pearl Harbor on the secret agreements between I. G. Farben and Standard Oil which hobbled U. S. defense production will take very seriously the news from Bonn (*New York Times,* Oct. 14), "U. S. Arms Makers Are Pouring Capital Into West Germany." All too familiar names like Krupp's appear in the reports of new armament alliances between U. S. and German firms. Their agreements, like many of the cartel pacts which the Truman committee exposed, may well contain clauses contrary to American interests, and some steps ought to be taken by Congress at least to force the filing of all such agreements with the U. S. government, particularly the anti-trust division of Justice. The men who made and survived Hitler are not the most trustworthy of partners. It was bad enough to give the signal for rearmament of the Reich. It is a new and worse step to allow the development of a private arms business in partnership with American arms makers like General Dynamics and the aircraft companies. This will create vested interests in international trouble to maintain a market for their arms. Of course, Germany is now our ally against Communism. But it is well to remember that she was our "bulwark against Bolshevism" then, too.

Next A German Nuclear Arms Business

The emergence of powerful German-American combines in the arms business is made the more serious by the campaign developing for further amendment of the Atomic Energy Act at the next session of Congress in order to permit us to engage in the nuclear rearmament of Germany. The ax of German nuclear rearmament is again ground in a report made on contract to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by something called the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania, another of those mechanisms by which cold war intellectuals can climb on the gravy train of the arms program, providing high class rationalizations for the Pentagon and other official agencies. Having consulted among others with Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, the limited nuclear war sage on the Rockefeller Brothers Fund payroll, the report rehashes the argument for giving nuclear arms to our allies, the nightmare dreamed up in his latter years by John Foster Dulles. The notion that the world will be made a safer and saner place by spreading deadly weapons more widely requires for its defense intellectual contortions so arduous that they deserve to be well paid, though we don't see why the Senate Foreign Relations Committee should pay for what General Dynamics or the Rockefeller Brothers Fund would otherwise finance. Who deserves contempt more than intellectuals who choose to serve the forces of destruction? *The next step after a nuclear rearmed Germany will be a private German atomic arms industry* (Krupp already has an interest in the first German reactor). The industrial genuises to whom we owe the crematorium will then be able to apply their talents more widely.

Children Safe at Last

"The child . . . shall be brought up in a spirit of understanding, tolerance, friendship among peoples, peace and universal brotherhood. . . ."

—Draft Declaration of the Rights of the Child adopted 70-0 at the United Nations Oct. 19.

And, of course, secure in the knowledge that should his right to grow up as a capitalist and/or Marxist-Leninist seem to be endangered, his elders stand ready to protect him by blowing the world to bits.

Too Alert For Our Own Good

On Thursday, Oct. 15, Major Gen. Caldera, Deputy Inspector General for Safety of the Air Force, disclosed that since 1950 the Air Force had lost 3,471 pilots and 7,062 planes in accidents. This is an average of about 700 Air Force plane crashes a year, no slight number. Some of these are Strategic Air Command planes carrying atom bombs on their round-the-clock "alert" and sure enough next day an 8-jet B-52 carrying two nuclear bombs collided with a jet tanker over Hardinsburg, Ky. The crash was accompanied by the usual reassuring statements. SAC claimed it was the first accident of its kind on its round-the-clock refuelling program and Pentagon briefings boasted that the crash "proved" atom bombs cannot be exploded by accident because they are carried "unarmed," i.e. the firing mechanism is detached from the bomb and can only be set in place by the plane commander. There *was* some danger that the bombs might break open, scattering radioactive dust, but they were found intact and ready for use all over again, with no extra cost to the taxpayer except maybe for a little spit and polish. Somehow we're not as reassured as we should be. Some day, just by the law of probability, a real atomic accident would seem bound to happen. It seems to us that if we go on with this tense-trigger operation long enough and the Russians don't bomb us, the SAC will.

Another Beria at Work?

Since every head of the Soviet secret police in the last quarter century (Yagoda, Yehzov, Beria) has eventually been executed as an imperialist agent, we can only hope that the latest spy-fuss in Moscow was not a deliberate provocation against a member of the U. S. Embassy staff by a new crop of imperialist agents in order to "upset the spirit of Camp David" on direct orders, of course, from the CIA.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Documentary: Boom Forecast As A Result of Arms Cuts in Survey by "Nation's Business"

U.S. Chamber of Commerce Organ Sees No Need to Fear Peace

(From Nation's Business)

"Any abrupt softening of cold war pressures—if it comes—can bring this country a boom, not the recession suggested by such phrases as 'peace scare.' It will bring changes likely to affect your business. The principle changes you should expect are:

"A rise in consumer spending far surpassing the cut in military spending and concentrated on such things as houses, automobiles, furniture and household appliances. A terrific upsurge in spending for new plants and equipment. Larger incomes for everybody to spend and invest. A higher standard of living. Lower taxes. A larger labor force. Increased pressure for federal aid of various kinds. A temporary threat of inflation which can readily be countered.

Some Hurt Temporarily

"Some industries and individuals would be hurt temporarily. Soon these industries and all the rest of us would be wondering how we ever paid such high taxes and denied ourselves so many of the benefits our productive capacity makes possible. Those who feel that the present $46 billion of spending for national security is a necessary prop to the economy overlook the fact that this expenditure is a pressure as well as a stimulant. . . . The question then becomes: How quickly and to what extent would consumer buying take up the slack left by reduced military spending?

"The answer is: Probably in one year—certainly in two—the economy would be stronger than ever. What has happened after previous cuts in military spending supports this prediction:

"In 1919 military spending was $18 billion—more than 20 percent of all business done that year. These expenditures dropped to $6.5 billion in 1920 and to about $5 billion in 1921. But the total spending dropped less than five percent in constant dollars in 1920, nine percent more in 1921. By 1922 the economy was back to the 1919 level; in 1923 it was 10 percent higher.

"After World War II, defense spending was cut 90 percent or $145 billion (in 1958 dollars), but total business dropped only 13 percent in 1945, unemployment never went above four percent and recovery came as quickly as in 1919.

"After Korea, defense spending dropped 25 percent, but the total volume of business done dropped less than two percent from 1953 to 1954 and by 1955 business was six percent above previous peaks.

"In all these cases consumer shortages and inadequate factory capacity helped hurry the upturn. Today industry has nearly adequate capacity in most lines and consumers are well stocked. Standards of living are high. The need to spend is less urgent than after a war period.

"To estimate how much these changes would delay an upturn in consumer spending to fill the void left by a defense cutback, we must assume the answers to some questions: How much will defense spending be cut? Will the cut come slowly or gradually? How quickly will taxes be cut and how? Will the cut come in a period of boom or recession?

'How much cut? Even assuming the end of the cold war, we would not stop all defense spending. A reasonable first step would be to reduce our offensive forces. We could cut back on atomic submarines, on foreign bases, and reduce the size of the armed forces. We might maintain our defense establishment and continue work on missiles because of the value of the research and as a deterrent to attack. Such a program might cut spending in half, or by $23 billion a year.

"How quick the cut? It would take a lot of persuading to convince the government that such a cut should be made abruptly. Precautions, both military and economic, would suggest that it should be spread over two years at least.

"Tax cuts? All of this money would not be returned to the people. Some would undoubtedly be used to give additional support to present activities—highways, for instance. . . . Assuming that these (pressure) groups should win $3 billion for their new schemes, a tax cut of $20 billion would be possible. . . .

"All this adds up to the fact that in the long run the economy can grow as fast with a low, as with a high, military component. It should be noted, too, that the civilian market grows in more stable fashion than does the military . . . if the day ever comes when the Soviet is willing to fight with ploughshares rather than swords, our standard of living will rise faster than ever and cylical swings will be reduced."

On its cover the latest, October 1959, issue of Nation's Business, organ of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, carries the headline, "What Peace Would Do to You." The survey is so optimistic we excerpt it here. That this big business organ should take so hopeful a view of disarmament is good news on the peace front.

Justice Dept. Opposes The One Effective Way to Enforce Negro Voting Rights

We call the attention of those concerned with Negro rights to an exclusive interview carried by the Washington Sunday Star October 18 with a "high-ranking Justice official" expressing bitter and contemptuous opposition to the recent Civil Rights Commission proposal for safeguarding voting rights in the South. Despite a formal denial issued as we go to press, The Star insists that its interview came from "a responsible and authoritative official."

The most important recommendation by the Civil Rights Commission was for the establishment of Federal registrars for Federal elections. This would end the run-around given Negroes who try to register, and stop the notorious misuse of literacy laws. The importance of this recommendation lies not only in the ease with which it could be enacted but also in the fact that two of the three Southern members of the Commission joined in it. The "high-ranking official" said the registrar proposal would do more harm than good and remarked acidly, "the best thing the Civil Rights Commission could do would be to go out of business."

The Commission's report criticized the Justice Department for having taken only three actions to enforce Negro voting rights in the two years since the Civil Rights law was passed. "Department officials," the Star reported. "take angry issue with this appraisal. They feel their own Civil Rights Division is proceeding at the proper pace to achieve gradual progress without inflaming the south unnecessarily." At such a pace there is no danger of Mr. Rogers whizzing past Senator Eastland.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Laotian Premier's Paper Points Way to Settlement of Trouble We Precipitated

Moscow May Make Peking "Behave" But Who'll Sober Down Washington?

State Department speech writers are turning out a flood of warnings to Moscow that we expect Khrushchev to make Peking behave. Khrushchev's recent speeches in Peking show he is doing his part. But are we? It takes two to make peace. Stability will never be achieved in the Far East if we think we can impose humiliating conditions on Communist China. One place where we could show good faith without too much difficulty is in Laos.

The first sign of good sense was an editorial in the Laotian Premier's paper, *L'Independant,* which U. S. news services failed to report but which we saw in a Reuters dispatch published by the *Washington Post* Oct. 17. *L'Independent* forecast a compromise by which the Laotian government would release eight jailed leftwing leaders, and guarantee the future existence of their Neo Lao Haksat Party, in return for an end of rebel activity and of North Vietnamese aid for it.

This would turn back the clock to the point where U. S. military influence precipitated trouble by urging the Laotians to outlaw the Leftists in violation of the Geneva accords.

Discreet Elision

United Nations, N. Y.—A revised edition of the biographies of the U. S. delegation to the current session of the UN General Assembly, as circulated to the press, has dropped one sentence from the earlier sketch of Harold Riegelman. This said, "Since 1938 he has served as American legal adviser to the Chinese Embassy in Washington, D. C."

Peace could be reestablished firmly if the International Control Commission were invited back to guarantee a settlement.

Our U. S. attitude toward these tripartite commissions (Indian, Polish and Canadian) set up by the 1954 Indochinese agreements are inconsistent. We favor the one in Vietnam to help protect the South from the Communist North. We have been trying to get rid of the one in Cambodia in order to pressure that neutralist country. In Laos, by a ruse, we encouraged the government to get rid of the commission in order to violate the accords and throw the left-wingers in jail.

These control commissions have wider significance. They represent Communist willingness to abandon the kind of 50-50 divided commissions which proved so exasperatingly futile in Korea and to allow neutral chairmanship instead. Applied in Indochina, they represent constructive mechanisms for co-existence. Upsetting these commissions where it serves our purpose makes the U. S. look hypocritical in China's eyes and anxious to make trouble on its southern border.

Peking's Peace Offer to Chiang

The London Sunday Times of Oct. 18 carried a cable from Hong Kong giving fuller details than have appeared in the U. S. press on the new Peking offer to Chiang Kai-shek. Chiang's elder son, General Chiang Ching-kuo, was invited to Peking and peace proposed on the following lines:

Both sides to recognize Formosa as part of China; all foreign troops and technicians to be withdrawn from it; the present Nationalist government would retain 'independent' status, exercising its own form of election, and maintaining its own armed forces, national flag and political organization.

The Sunday Times said the invitation was made publicly and the peace proposals advanced privately on behalf of the Chinese Communists by former Nationalist General, Chang Chi-chung, who defected to Peking. The British paper regards the offer as a mere anti-American provocation. We think it makes sense. Why would not such a settlement, if Formosan autonomy were safeguarded by the UN (with Peking admitted to membership), offer an honorable way out?

The Laotian problem cannot be solved by military means; handfuls of guerrillas can operate too easily in these jungle fastnesses. The problem is political and can only be solved by political means. We hope that *L'Independant's* suggestion will be noted when the UN's debate on Laos begins.

The U. S. press in the meantime seems to grow phonier and sillier in its treatment of news from Laos. In the former category is the story out of Tokyo that the UN investigating team had evidence that the Laotian rebels were fighting under the direct supervision of Marshal Peng Teh-huai. This was officially denied by the Japanese Foreign Ministry and by the Argentine member of the UN inquiry group.

In the latter category was the *AP* story in last Monday's (Oct. 19) papers saying that Southern Laos was "seething with pro-Communist Pathet Lao rebels." The story itself estimates the number of rebels at 500 to 600 and the government soldiers in the area at 5,000. Laos seems to seethe very easily.

Rare Insight from An Official Source: Ignored by Most of the Press

"The basic trouble in the world results from the fact that we live in a primitive international society, with little recognized international law and no way to sustain it. I go so far as to say that if communism were to disappear tomorrow and the Soviet Union were to become a Jeffersonian or Lincolnian democracy, there would still exist very serious danger of conflict between the two great power centers in the world.

"I emphasize this because there seems to be a tendency on the part of many people to think that all the troubles of the world come from the fact that Soviet Russia is a communist state. The situation is not that simple. Even if we had a solution of the ideological differences, we still would have to organize the world's international relations in a way to prevent national sovereignties from clashing head-on. Britain and Russia quarrelled for 100 years before 1914. Most Christian nations have fought each other as readily as Christian against pagan. Nations pay little attention to race, religion or ideology when they choose partners in what they conceive to be their national interests.

"The important point is this: We must not overly concentrate on the ideological differences and come to the conclusion that if only we can solve those, the world will be at peace. We must realize that while these ideological differences add to the immediacy of the problem, a more important task is to create an international law enforcement body with sufficient strength and authority to settle international disputes. Once this is done, perhaps co-existence of all races and ideologies will be possible."

—George V. Allen, director U.S. Information Agency, before the Public Relations Society of America, Oct. 15.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Three Items From the Global Struggle for Freedom of Thought

Thirty Intellectuals Facing Jail Here in First Amendment Cases

So far as we can recall, Joe McCarthy never succeeded in sending a single American to jail: those like Harvey O'Connor who were held in contempt of the McCarthy committee were all finally acquitted on one technicality or another. But now in the wake of the Barenblatt-Uphaus rulings, some 30 American intellectuals are heading for jail because they refused on grounds of conscience and First Amendment to inform on other radicals or discuss their views before various witch hunt bodies, Congressional and State. This is an anomaly that cries out for attention in an America that boasts of recovery from McCarthyism and talks self-righteously at the UN and abroad about being the leader of "the free world." The first of these intellectuals to enter jail will be Lloyd Barenblatt and Willard Uphaus, and the send-off to be given them the night of Thursday, November 5, at the New York Center, 227 W. 46th St., should be turned into a demonstration against our American Inquisition by all who still believe in intellectual freedom from interference by the State.

Tito's Radio Uses Djilas's Line (In Polish)

"Practice has shown," said a Yugoslav broadcast to East Europe in Polish Oct. 14, "that in the initial stages of socialist building . . . there emerges in the community a more or less strong stratum of bureaucracy which is in a definite, often very privileged position." This is the thesis, of course, expounded by Milovan Djilas's book, *"The New Class,"* for which he is serving seven years at hard labor. Now that Yugoslavia is under attack by the Soviet bloc, its official radio uses the Djilas line to needle its neighbors, calling for an "open, frank and objective examination of deformations of socialism." Yugoslavia itself remains an unsafe place for such discussion. In Warsaw the heretical Marxist philosopher, Kulakowski, goes on teaching at the university. In the Soviet Union, Pasternak goes on writing and receives foreign visitors unmolested. But Djilas is still in jail. Tito continues to be Stalinist in his attitude toward writers who dare to be critical. Radio Warsaw ought to answer Radio Belgrade by broadcasting this back in Serbo-Croatian.

On Limited Warfare

Don'tcha worry, honey chile,
Don'tcha cry no more;
It's jest a li'l ole atom bomb
In a li'l ole lim'ted war.

It's jest a bitsy warhead, chile,
On a li'l ole tactical shell,
And all it'll do is blow us—all
To a li'l old lim'ted hell.

Anonymous

—Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, Oct. '59.

Khrushchev and the McCarran Act

Those who took part in the long fight against the Mundt-Nixon bill which the late Senator McCarran finally put through Congress as the Internal Security Act of 1950 will find a familiar note in Khrushchev's speech Oct. 11 at Krasnoyarsk. The Soviet Premier touch on discussions he had on his visit here "about the so-called free dissemination of ideas" and said, "They want to foist upon us all kinds of trash that would poison the minds of Soviet people. Can we agree to this? Of course not! Our people do not want to consume bad food poisoned with the venom of bourgeois ideas." This remarkably parallels the views which led Mundt, Nixon and McCarran to frame the Internal Security Act. It sets up a Subversive Activities Control Board to act as a kind of ideological Pure Food and Drug Administration, with power to require all organizations adjudged communistic to label their publications and broadcasts subversive so the reader or listener would know he was in danger of imbibing poisonous ideas. With Khrushchev, they thought the State—like the medieval church—had a duty to decide which ideas were bad and to protect people from them. Our Supreme Court has yet to decide whether this can somehow be reconciled with Jeffersonianism. For that matter there is no advocacy of thought control in Marx or Engels either (or even Lenin).

If You Send A Stamped Self-Addressed Envelope, We'll Mail A Free Sample Copy For You to A Friend

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

10/26/59

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐

I.F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.
NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington 15, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED